DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 242 220 FL 014 300

AUTHOR Rodriguez, Manuel C.
TITLE Current Status of O.P.I. in Intensive Language Programs.
PUB DATE 3 Mar 84
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (Colorado Springs, CO, March 1-3, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Competency Based Education; *Intensive Language Courses; *Language Proficiency; *Language Tests; *Oral Language; Professional Associations; Questioning Techniques; *Second Language Instruction
IDENTIFIERS American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Langs; Northern Arizona University; *Oral Proficiency Testing

ABSTRACT

Since the initial inquiry into oral proficiency and oral proficiency testing by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) in 1981, the growing interest in this form of testing is evidenced by increased participation in workshops, conference sessions, and training sessions devoted to it. Intensive language programs and an emphasis on spoken language have also emerged. Acquisition of functional oral ability is the current focus of language instruction, and oral proficiency interviews (OPI) have become an integral part of the proficiency assessment process. There are several types of intensive language programs being conducted in colleges and universities, using several variations on the original OPI and the ACTFL and Educational Testing Service guidelines and criteria. The type used at Northern Arizona University for its Spanish immersion program is modeled after Peace Corps training programs, with evaluation based on the Foreign Service Institute's model, adapted for academic grading. It was discovered that this adaptation was less a test of oral proficiency than an oral version of a discrete-point grammar achievement exam. Examiner note-taking also proved to inhibit students. The test was changed in format, and a weighted scale based on the academic 100% model within the ACTFL guidelines and giving more emphasis to performance than structure was adopted. Nonetheless, the grading is approached holistically, focusing on the level at which a student can sustain speech. The fourth stage of the program, equivalent to the first semester of third year Spanish, involves use of the OPI. Increased training opportunities for OPI examiners, especially within initial teacher training, and further research into the test's implications for curriculum and language instruction methods, are needed. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED242220

CURRENT STATUS OF O.P.I. IN INTENSIVE LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

by

Manuel C. Rodríguez, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Spanish
Northern Arizona University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Manuel C. Rodriguez

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL014300

Presented at the Southwest Conference on
the Teaching of Foreign Languages
Colorado Springs, Colorado - Mar 3, 1984

CURRENT STATUS OF O.P.I. IN INTENSIVE LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

In 1981, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages set up a series of task forces to deal with specific issues confronting our profession. The Southwest Conference on the Teaching of Languages was charged with the topic of "language proficiency" and any emerging trends related to proficiency testing. From this study[1], ten states were identified that required teacher candidates to take an examination in their specific teaching area(s); of the ten, Georgia and Massachusetts require prospective teachers to demonstrate oral language proficiency. California and Texas are in the process of establishing statewide oral language proficiency requirements and Arizona has charged a task force with developing oral proficiency testing for future foreign language teachers[2]. We are, as a profession, finally putting into force a requirement that has been talked about for over a decade.

Since the initial ACTFL task force, the growing interest in oral proficiency testing is evident in the increased participation in the number of workshops, conference sessions devoted to oral proficiency and the training sessions that have taken place in the past two years and the ones that are planned for the near future. A direct result of this increased interest in proficiency-based programs has been the emergence of intensive language programs and with them the current trend of placing emphasis on the "spoken language." The student must function within a time frame and with a logical structural format to convey an idea, or a series of ideas to communicate what he/she thinks or feels to another human

being in a language other than his/her mother tongue.

The foreign language teacher, then, has to prepare the students for "language performance;" what can the student do with what he/she has acquired (in the sense that Krashen and Terrell use this word), not learned. Language acquisition is the focus of language instruction at present. Helping students acquire functional oral ability is the task we as foreign language teachers are charged with. Along with this task come the development and implementation of evaluative techniques, and Oral Proficiency Interviews (O.P.I.) become an integral part of this process. O.P.I. is perhaps the most comprehensive and reliable oral evaluative technique developed over the last decade. The inclusion of oral proficiency guidelines in an academic curricula will insure consistency from one tester to another; consequently, we need to cope with and understand this evaluative instrument.

We must, first of all, bear in mind that oral proficiency does not promise to be the panacea of the future of foreign languages; it is not an evaluative technique that flourished overnight; it does not purport to have all the answers or to be the perfect instrument for evaluating oral testing; it does have major implications for our new direction in oral proficiency evaluation. The prime contribution of ACTFL's Provisional Proficiency Guidelines[3] and the E.T.S. Oral Proficiency Manual[4] is the descriptive criteria of each proficiency level. ACTFL's descriptors are designed for academic application in each of the most common languages taught at the university level, i.e., Spanish, French and German. In addition, a set of generic descriptors is included in the guidelines.

These contain a general description, applicable to all languages, as to what constitutes each level of performance to be evaluated. Also included are levels of performance in the areas of listening, comprehension, reading and writing. The performance levels are described in each of the aforementioned languages with not only specific language expectations but also examples in the language of what constitute typical responses and errors at each level of performance. It is by far the most comprehensive guideline ever developed for academic curricular development on foreign language testing.

O.P.I. has been in existence for quite sometime, but only recently has it gained in importance and is being recognized as a useful means of testing oral proficiency. In many respects we all have been advocating oral proficiency in our classrooms. Student demands and needs have led to numerous activities that require active speaking participation by everyone in the classroom. Our testing methods have not been directed toward oral proficiency, at least not totally, and the main reason for the avoidance of oral proficiency testing has been time constraints. In addition to the lack of time, due to the number of students (from 25-35), there is also the problem of grading: how will the student's speech production be objectively graded? This is the time for O.P.I. to be recognized, not as a threatening force but as an instrument that has been needed to fulfill a major goal in foreign language teaching--to teach our students to function in the target language and to properly and consistently evaluate their performance in the spoken language. In his discussion of effective evaluations,

Tracy Terrell inadvertently sums up very eloquently what O.P.I. will do for our future goals in foreign languages: "The key to effective testing is the realization that testing has a profound effect on what goes on in the classroom. . .Quite simply, if we want students to acquire a second language, we should give tests that promote the use of acquisition activities."[5]

There are some intensive programs in the country developed after the Dartmouth Intensive Language Model: one is at the University of Florida, the other at Herbert H. Lehman College, a four-year campus of the City University of New York. Both programs have oral proficiency testing. Testing takes place for mid-term and finals at the University of Florida. Grades are determined to a large extent by student's participation in skits that they design and produce themselves, and individual interviews with a master teacher in the target language.[6] The grading scale is a written evaluation by the examiner on a scale "from 1 (low) to 6 (high) in the areas of a) pronunciation, b) correctness and clarity of expression, c) proper syntax, and d) active vocabulary. The tabulated scores represent recommendations to a master teacher, who remains solely responsible for assigning a final grade, by colleagues regarding a given student's performance."[7]

At Lehman College the department devised a modified FSI scale with categories from "0 (no knowledge) to 7 (native fluency) based on grammar, comprehension, vocabulary, accent, and fluency. Sample questions were provided to the examiners for each level. The examiners entered the classrooms and questioned each student

until they had ascertained his or her level of competency."[8]

There is yet another type of intensive program, the one at Northern Arizona University--the Spanish Immersion Program. We were very fortunate in 1974 to have all our Spanish faculty with Peace Corps teaching experience. With the enrollment problems all institutions of higher education had to overcome, we turned to the Peace Corps Model for our curricular innovation and from the experience we all had with the P.C. programs, we developed and implemented at N.A.U. our widely acclaimed Spanish Immersion Program.

Since our program was modeled after the Peace Corps experience, our evaluation of the student's performance in the program was based on a modified FSI model. We had to adapt our testing to meet academic grading criteria. Up until this year we have kept the same testing format we designed at the inception of the program: ten questions based on the material covered during the week (see Appendix A). At the end of the fourth week of study we administered one of the four final exams the students had during the program. The oral exam for the final followed the same format as the weekly exams. To prepare students for these final oral tests, the test on Fridays was administered by one of the professors teaching in the program. The program was directed by a coordinator assisted by three other experienced Spanish faculty members.

As can be perceived by the example in Appendix A, the oral tests we were administering had a flaw: all the student had to do was pay attention and if he/she was sharp enough--and some

were--just change the verb form to fit the subject and repeat the rest of the question verbatim and that would produce a more than average score. With this in mind, we were actually testing for language achievement rather than proficiency. The rating scale for these oral exams included: comprehension, fluency, grammar and pronunciation. Let's analyze these testing categories: if you repeat all the words in the sentence you score high in comprehension; do not stutter or pause in the middle of the breath group and the score is high in fluency; do the morphological and syntactical changes required and the score is high in grammar; this takes care of 75% of the exam. Pronunciation is probably the one area with which students have the most problems at the beginning of the semester, but towards the end of the first four weeks, they have more than satisfactory command of it. In a sense we were heading in the direction of oral proficiency testing (we gave more weight to the oral performance than the written skills) yet, as can be observed, we were doing an oral version of a grammar discrete-point exam that tested language achievement.

Another observation made of our testing program was that our individual testing process required the faculty member to take notes during the oral examination; this was for our own grading policies in case of a grade challenge by a student. Still, the foremost purpose of the note taking was to give the student feedback on his oral performance. The drawback to this approach was the student's inability to concentrate on what he was doing, given the visible and physical action of our writing of not only

mistakes but the positive things that were occurring during the exam.

At the beginning of the Spring semester of 1984, we had a conference with the faculty members assigned to the Immersion Program on the evaluative approach we would take with the program. Our most difficult obstacle was the inexperience of the faculty members in oral proficiency testing. They were given the rating scales of the ACTFL Provisional Proficiency Guidelines in order for them to become familiar with the objectives. To compensate for the lack of experience, discrete-point items were included in the weekly oral exam for the first three weeks; this was for part of the exam (see Appendix B). The second half of the exam consisted of a five-minute oral proficiency test. An interesting outcome of this procedure, designed to train our faculty members, was that even our below-average students did well on the discrete-point oral items, but when they had to perform in the language, their proficiency went considerably down according to their "rate of acquisition" of the weekly material. Prior to the exam the faculty were given guidelines to keep in mind during the exams (see Appendix C). What this has done is to give the testers confidence and once the fear of relying on one's judgment to make a decision of a student's oral performance is overcome, it can be done effectively.

The ACTFL guidelines we have talked about are very clear and the ratings are the following: 0, Novice Low, Novice Mid, Novice High, Intermediate Low, Intermediate Mid,

Intermediate High, Advanced, Advanced Plus and Superior. Obviously the one rating that will be no problem in evaluating is the 0--no ability whatsoever in the language; but the remaining rating scales would be very difficult to decipher in the transcripts by a registrar. How do we adapt the oral proficiency guidelines to an academic curriculum? One approach is to use a weighted scale based on 100% and to use the ACTFL level ratings on an ascending scale within the program development of "intensive" or "immersion" programs. Since in our Spanish Immersion Program we teach both semesters of first and second-year Spanish and the first semester of third-year Spanish, we can expect the students to perform at the Intermediate High level because they have covered an immense amount of material. However, in a traditionally taught Spanish course the highest expectation after one semester is Intermediate Low; the basic description given in the ACTFL Provisional Proficiency Guidelines for this level is: "Able to satisfy basic survival needs and minimum courtesy requirements."[9] We must at all times bear in mind the material that has been covered and what communicative tools the students have in order to perform effectively in the target language. Consequently, the weighted scale can be used to measure each performance on the basis of the criteria of the level one expects them to reach.

The grading scale we are using is based on a descending range based on 100 percent (see Appendix D). Each area of our evaluation is given a weight; the areas and their assigned value are: Gramática, 30%; Pronunciación, 20%; Fluidez, 20%; Contenido/

Ideas, 15%; and Calidad, 15%. Based on this we have placed more weight on the performance than on the structure; grammar is only 30% compared to 70% overall in the student's oral performance. To further illustrate this application: at the end of the first four weeks, our S.I.P. students have studied the present tense, all object pronouns, the formal commands and have had an introduction to the present subjunctive with the noun clauses and the formal commands. Taking into account the provisional guidelines of the manuals, the levels Novice Low to Intermediate Low best describe our first semester first-year Spanish course (or any first semester, first-year language course). These ranges offer the tester an area to establish a base floor and a ceiling to obtain a ratable sample of language production by the student. The descriptions of each level are global, i.e., they encompass a wide range of material, but by applying the concepts of the oral proficiency guidelines, each course segment can be structured within each of these guidelines, either by itself or combined. At the end of the 16th week, we can determine just where the student stands in these given criteria of performance.

Since the oral proficiency test is an integrative test and not a discrete point test, we have to look at this instrument from a holistic point of view. The ratings are expressed in global terms by comparing the totality of the student's speaking ability to the descriptions at each level. Included in these ratings are factors that contribute to the overall performance: pronunciation, fluency, grammar and vocabulary. These

factors have to be considered in light of how they are integrated into the student's performance. The descending scales we are using allow for exceptional performances and those that are marginal. The descriptions that we have at each level are the ones that give us the standardization of the grading since we now have set criteria for performance objectives for each course segment. Underlying this whole process is the SUSTAINED LEVEL at which the student can speak. If the student falls within the 68 to 78% level, the average score he will receive will be in that range; if he peaks out at 78%, that is indicative of what the student can do and if the percentage is converted into a grade it will be a "C" in this case.

The final segment of the program is the first semester of third-year Spanish and not all the students will reach this level. This is natural since not all the students achieve the same proficiency during the course of study. The students that do reach this level will have varying degrees of sustained performance and their peak levels will also vary. At this point proficiency testing is curriculum free; it will focus exclusively on language competency without regard to length of time or manner in which that level of proficiency has been acquired. The evaluative process at this stage will test everything the student knows about how to use the language. This is an Oral Proficiency Interview.

It is very important to understand that the "principal procedure involved in all ratings is to compare the speech sample in the test (interview) with the level descriptions to find the

closest match." During the evaluations we are looking for patterns of strengths and weaknesses, not isolated errors. Probably the weakest aspect of teachers in the role of testers is that we have a tendency to help the student; we cannot stop teaching. This is good, but we have to divorce ourselves from the actual teaching, at least for a little while, and concentrate on the job at hand which is evaluating what we have taught. Our number one priority in oral proficiency testing is to let the student do the talking, let the student show us how well and to what extent s/he can perform in the target language.

The key to oral proficiency is contingent on the training workshops in the direct application of the O.P.I. method. We need these workshops on a local, regional, and statewide basis. Projects such as the certification of bilingual teachers, the Texas program, the Arizona oral proficiency testing for future foreign language teachers, are all leading the way to future training in the O.P.I. process of evaluation. Our responsibility is to continue in the development of the evaluation of the instrument itself, which, like any evaluative instrument, is not perfect--and much remains to be done. We need to encourage further investigation into the development of oral proficiency testing skills at the university level and in the exploration of the implications of the oral interview on curricula and methods of language instruction.

As is pointed out in the Educational Testing Service (E.T.S.) Manual, "A valid instrument. . .is understood to mean one which actually tests what it purports to test. This is known

as CONTENT VALIDITY. FACE VALIDITY, also a characteristic of the oral interview, has to do with whether a test has the appearance of doing what it purports to do, or feels to the cnadidate like a valid test. A well-structured oral proficiency interview tests speaking ability in a real-life language context--a conversation. It is almost by definition a valid measure of speaking ability."[11] The groundwork, the foundation has been established by the aforementioned predecessors of O.P.I. The descriptive levels developed by ACTFL/E.T.S. for academic curricula assure to a great degree content validity. There is stability and consistency of content from one exam to another. The descriptors for each level of performance maintain content validity. If as oral proficiency testers we were not looking for the same linguistic levels described in the provisional guidelines, content validity could indeed be questioned. Thus the importance of the training workshops for the professionals in the teaching field. This is especially true of those who are in the training programs at the Colleges of Education. There exists a tremendous need to provide all foreign language teachers with a common understanding of O.P.I. standards to strengthen the reliability of the testing strategy. Therefore, by making it an integral part of our student-teacher training program at the universities, reliability of our future oral proficiency testers will be assured.

References

1
Johnson, Carl H. and LaBouve, Bobby W. A Status Report on the Testing of Prospective Language Teachers for Initial State Certification. New York: ACTFL/Southwest Conference on Language Teaching, 1982.

2
The ACTFL Language Proficiency Projects Update - 1983 on New Grant Projects under Teacher Certification states: ACTFL has been awarded a grant from the Undergraduate International Studies Program of the Department of Education to establish a proficiency-based model for foreign language teacher certification in the state of Texas. Specifically, ACTFL will train faculty at higher education institutions around the state to interview and rate students on their oral proficiency in anticipation of a state-mandated oral proficiency requirement that has been proposed. This project is being conducted with the cooperation of the Texas Education Agency, the Texas State Department of Education, and the Texas Foreign Language Association.

3
American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. ACTFL Provisional Proficiency Guidelines. New York. 1982.

4
Educational Testing Service. E.T.S. Oral Proficiency Testing Manual. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service. 1982.

5
Krashen, Stephen D. and Terrell, Tracy D. The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom. (San Francisco: The Alemany Press, 1983), p. 165.

6
Johnson, Otto. "Five Years with the Rassias Method in German: a Follow-Up Report from the University of Florida." Foreign Language Annals. V16 N 5 (October 1983), pp. 343-354.

7
William, Rose. "Intensive Language Instruction in a Public University." ADFL Bulletin, v15 n2 (November 1983), pp. 53-56.

8
op. cit., p. 55.

9
op. cit., p. 27

10
E.T.S., op. cit., p. 19

11
op. cit., p. 13

APPENDIX A

PROGRAMA DE INMERSION EN ESPAÑOL Nombre_____

			COMP.	FLUEN.	GRAM.	PRONUN.	
			2____	2____	3____	3____	=
1.	a)	Buenos días, ¿Cómo está Ud.?	1____	1____	2____	2____	=
	b)	Yo estoy bien, ¿Y Ud.?	0____	0____	1____	1____	=
					0____	0____	=
						TOTAL	=
			2____	2____	3____	3____	=
2.	a)	¿Cómo te llamas?	1____	1____	2____	2____	=
	b)	¿Cómo se llama Ud.?	0____	0____	1____	1____	=
					0____	0____	=
						TOTAL	=
			2____	2____	3____	3____	=
3.	a)	¿Dónde está Ud.?	1____	1____	2____	2____	=
	b)	¿Dónde está el profesor?	0____	0____	1____	1____	=
					0____	0____	=
						TOTAL	=
			2____	2____	3____	3____	=
4.	a)	¿Cómo está la familia?	1____	1____	2____	2____	=
	b)	¿Cómo está el profesor?	0____	0____	1____	1____	=
					0____	0____	=
						TOTAL	=
			2____	2____	3____	3____	=
5.	a)	¿Habla Ud. español?	1____	1____	2____	2____	=
	b)	¿Hablan Uds. inglés?	0____	0____	1____	1____	=
					0____	0____	=
						TOTAL	=
			2____	2____	3____	3____	=
6.	a)	¿Estudia Ud. español?	1____	1____	2____	2____	=
	b)	¿Qué estudia Ud.?	0____	0____	1____	1____	=
					0____	0____	=
						TOTAL	=
			2____	2____	3____	3____	=
			1____	1____	2____	2____	=
7.	a)	¿Dónde vive Ud.?	0____	0____	1____	1____	=
	b)	¿Vive Ud. en el dormitorio?			0____	0____	=
						TOTAL	=
			2____	2____	3____	3____	=
			1____	1____	2____	2____	=
8.	a)	¿Aprende Ud. mucho en la clase?	0____	0____	1____	1____	=
	b)	¿Qué aprende Ud. en la clase?			0____	0____	=
						TOTAL	=
			2____	2____	3____	3____	=
9.	a)	¿Lee Ud. mucho en casa?	1____	1____	2____	2____	=
	b)	¿Lee Ud. mucho o poco?	0____	0____	1____	1____	=
					0____	0____	=
						TOTAL	=
			2____	2____	3____	3____	=
10.	a)	¿Escribe Ud. mucho en clase?	1____	1____	2____	2____	=
	b)	¿Escriben bien Uds.?	0____	0____	1____	1____	=
					0____	0____	=

APPENDIX B

PROGRAMA DE INMERSION EN ESPAÑOL
Examen Oral #_____
Nombre_____Fecha_____

		COMP.	FLUEN.	GRAM.	PRON.	
1.	a) ¿Qué hace Ud. después de vestirse? b) ¿Qué hace Ud. después de desayunarse?	4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ 0____	4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ 0____	4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ 0____	4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ 0____ Total	= = = = = _____
2.	a) ¿Qué le parece a Ud. Flagstaff? b) ¿Qué le parece a Ud. la N.A.U.?	4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ 0____	4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ 0____	4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ 0____	4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ 0____ Total	= = = = = _____
3.	a) ¿A qué hora se acuesta Ud.? b) ¿A qué hora se levanta Ud.?	4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ 0____	4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ 0____	4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ 0____	4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ 0____ Total	= = = = = _____
4.	a) ¿Qué estás estudiando ahora? b) ¿Qué estás aprendiendo ahora?	4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ 0____	4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ 0____	4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ 0____	4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ 0____ Total	= = = = = _____
5.	(Answer with 2 pronouns) a) ¿Me das tu libro? b) ¿Le das dinero a tu papá?	4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ 0____	4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ 0____	4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ 0____	4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ 0____ Total	= = = = = _____

El alumno hablará por 5 minutos:
tema: DESCRIBIR SU RUTINA DIARIA.

APPENDIX C

ORAL PROFICIENCY FINAL EXAM - SPANISH IMMERSION - SPA 101

1. Student will talk about his family and will pick one day or weekend in the past and describe. NOTE: Check for usage of the following grammatical constructions:

    1. Present tense
    2. Present progressive
    3. Preterite
    4. Pronouns
        a. Reflexive
        b. Direct
        c. Indirect
        d. Direct and indirect in combinations

2. A sample of questions that can be asked:

    a. WARM-UPS (to put the student at ease)
        Hola, ¿Cómo estás hoy?
        ¿Como te llamas?
        ¿De dónde eres?
        ¿Dónde vives aquí en Flagstaff?
        ¿Cómo se llama tu compañero(a) de cuarto?
        ¿Dónde está el dormitorio _____?

    b. Questions for the family theme:

        ¿Qué me puedes decir de tu familia?
        y tu papá, ¿qué hace?
        ¿Trabaja tu mamá?
        ¿Cómo son tus hermanos?
        ¿Tú eres el menor o el mayor?
        ¿Cómo es tu casa? ¿tu cuarto?
        ¿Cómo son tus abuelos?

    c. Questions for the past event:

        Depending on what the student selects, a day or a weekend, follow up with verbs in the preterite: y entonces, ¿qué hiciste? y tú, ¿fuiste sólo? ¿Te gustó el_____?, etc.

3. Remember that the most important aspect of the oral proficiency-type testing is to let the student do all the talking. Your questions should lead him to show us what he can do with the language he has learned up to now; at this point we are testing for Spanish 101.

APPENDIX D

PROGRAMA DE IMMERSION EN ESPAÑOL
Oral Proficiency Exam

Nombre_____ Fecha_____

Gramática	30%	19	21	24	27	30	_____
Pronunciación	20%	12	14	16	18	20	_____
Fluidez	20%	12	14	16	18	20	_____
Contenido/Ideas	15%	7	9	11	13	15	_____
Calidad	15%	7	9	11	13	15	_____
		(57-67)	(68-78)	(79-89)	(90-100)		
					TOTAL		_____

Puntos sobresalientes	Problemas